

REMARKS

With respect to the amendments to the drawings: Adding cross-hatching to Figs. 10 and 11 does not change the structure illustrated, merely makes the drawings easier to interpret. Similarly, adjusting the position of the lead line in Fig. 10 for reference number 109 merely more clearly delineates the "cavity 109" "in which the spool 110 is received", as discussed in paragraph 48. With respect to Fig. 11, paragraph 49 indicates that like parts are given like reference numbers. Hence, the adjusted lead line in Fig. 11 for the reference 109 is also clearly supported. Similarly the illustration of the orifice 114 in a position similar to that of the orifice 114 of Fig. 10 (that is, in a position to communicate "the reaction through the small orifice 114 of the reaction pin 112" to force the spool 110 to the left (per paragraph 49)) is clearly supported.

Support for the change to paragraph 30 is found in paragraph 29. Support for the change to paragraph 33 is found in Figs. 7 and 8. Support for the change to paragraph 45 is found in Fig. 8. Support for the change to paragraph 47 is found within paragraph 47.

Thus, it is clear that these changes to the drawings and the specification do not add new matter, and are merely minor editorial clarifications, which are not intended to, and do not, change the scope of the application.

With respect to the requirement of paragraph 1 of the Office Action mailed September 29, 2010, to elect a species, Applicant hereby elects SPECIES II: the species depicted in Figs. 9 and 10. Applicant believes that the following claims read upon the elected species: Claims 1 through 8, 13, and 15 through 18.

This election is made WITH TRAVERSE. Although Applicant agrees with the Examiner that the species identified by the Examiner are patentably distinct, it is respectfully submitted that claims could be examined together without imposing an undue burden. As stated in § 803 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, "[i]f the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits even though it includes claims to

distinct or independent inventions.” Under this standard, it is believed the search of groups jointly would not impose a serious burden, since at least Claims 1 through 8, 13, and 15 through 17 (as amended) are generic to all three Species.

Favorable consideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Allen W. Inks/

Allen W. Inks

Reg. No. 37,358

MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC
One Maritime Plaza, Fifth Floor
720 Water Street, Toledo, Ohio 43604
419.255.5900
419.255.9639 (fax)